

**2. In a narrative of 7-10 pages, describe how your program has changed to meet the requirements of Standard V in the following areas:**

- **Course content**
- **Field experiences**
- **P-12 district/school partnerships**
- **Faculty development**

**In areas where no changes were necessary, briefly indicate why.**

### **Course Content**

After the new Standard V was approved (July 2007) the Department faculty began discussions fall 2007 on the content of Standard V and the alignment of the Teacher Education Program at WSU with Standard V. Program faculty reviewed and analyzed elements of Standard V at each department/program meeting since the fall of 2007 and ongoing programmatic and course content changes have been made since that time. One of the elements that faculty clarified was student-based evidence. The WSU Teacher Education faculty believe that student-based evidence and student communication/voice are two different things. One, student-based evidence includes test scores, student writing, products, portfolios, etc. – all student work samples. Two, student communication/voice, includes evidence that students can communicate the targets of a lesson, understand the connections between the targets and assessment, etc. In examining our program, faculty felt that there was a heavy emphasis placed on collecting and analyzing student-based evidence, but that course work and field experiences needed to be revised to reflect student communication/voice aspects. An overview of some general changes to the WSU program are highlighted below, and then some examples of more specific changes (e.g., in course work and field experiences) are provided.

### **General Changes in Program/Course Content**

The WSU Teacher Education program has four signature assignments/assessments that all teacher candidates must successfully complete. Although these assignments are submitted at various times and in a range of courses across the program, students' ability to successfully complete these assignments is dependent on all course work, not just the course in which the assignment is submitted. As changes are made to the signature assignment/assessments, multiple relevant courses must be changed/revised as they play a role in preparing students for these assignments/assessments. Table 1 provides an overview of the signature assignments/assessments,

where the assignments are submitted, the alignment with Standard V, and the changes that have been made to the course content/program as a result of the alignment with Standard V.

As can be seen in Table 1, the signature assignments/assessments have been aligned with Standard V, as the process for developing/refining these signature assignments/assessments occurred simultaneously with the process of aligning the program courses and experiences with Standard V.

**Table 1**

Signature Assignments/Assessments, Submission and Evaluation, Alignment with Standard V, and Changes Made for Alignment with Standard V

Signature Assignments and Assessments	Where and When Assignments and Assessments Submitted and Evaluated	Alignment with Standard V	Changes to Content, Assignments and Assessments for Alignment with Standard V
Technology Enhanced Lesson Plan (submitted in Technology Course)	T&L 445 Elementary Ed (first semester) T&L 466 Secondary Ed (first semester) T&L 517 MIT (EI and Sec Ed) (first summer)	5.2 B, C, D 5.3 A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addition of assessment component focused specifically on collecting student-based evidence and student communication/voice as a part of the Lesson Plan assignment.</li> </ul>
Classroom Management Plan (submitted in Classroom Management course)	T&L 310 Elementary Ed(second semester) T&L 465 Secondary Ed (second semester) T&L 525 MIT (second semester)	5.2 B, C 5.3 A, B, C, D 5.4 A, B, C The Plan included a strong emphasis on student-centered instruction/management, classroom community, culturally responsive management, personalized instruction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan revised to include instruction in and importance of collecting student communication/voice about learning communities.</li> </ul>
Integrated Unit Plan	T&L 499/385 Elementary Ed (third semester) T&L 464 Secondary Ed	5.1 A, B, C 5.2 A, B, C, D 5.3 A, B, C, D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission of the Secondary Ed Unit Plans will be changed fall 2009 to be submitted in Assessment course. Building the capacity to collect and analyze student-based evidence and</li> </ul>

	(first semester – note changes for fall 09) T&L 540/520/702 MIT (final semester of program)		<p>communication will be a focus of all courses before this submission. So all fall 09 course content in secondary education will reflect this change to support the capacity of students to collect student-based evidence and communication.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rubric/assignment changed to include an emphasis on the collection of student-based evidence and communication/voice. All courses contributing to preparing students to complete the Integrated Unit Plan will include instruction in collection and analysis of student-based evidence and communication/voice.</li> <li>• Means to engage family with content of unit.</li> <li>• Statement of community demographics and addressing diversity/marginalized students and engagement.</li> </ul>
Positive Impact on Student Learning	Submitted at the conclusion of student teaching.	5.1 A, B, C 5.2 A, B, C, D 5.3 A, B, C, D 5.4 A, B, C	<p>Changes to this assignment/assessment have been made on a continual basis, with suggestions from our P-12 partners and our PEAB, to more closely align with all of Standard V. These changes affect every one of the program courses, in that each course plays a role in building the capacity of teacher candidates to collect and analyze student-based evidence and communication. Fall 2009, all course work will address this (with a focus on the specific area such as math, reading, science). Teacher candidates have always collected student-based evidence in this assignment, but fall 2009 will also include requirements for collecting student communication/voice evidence.</p>

### Specific Changes to Course Content

As mentioned previously, all faculty have aligned their course content with Standard V as relevant and appropriate (see Table 2). The alignment activities conducted required changes in the content of the courses and in methods of instruction. Describing changes for all courses in the Teacher Education program would exceed the page limits of this report. Provided below are some examples of individual course changes in both the Elementary and Secondary Education programs (all are required courses).

#### Elementary Education Program (undergraduate and MIT)

T&L 390/T&L 594 Integrating Fine Arts into K-8 Curriculum was revised to include an emphasis on sustainability and aesthetic reasoning, and the integration of those two areas into teacher candidates' P-8 lesson plans, unit plans, and curriculum. Assignments related to sustainability and aesthetic reasoning include: *Chris Jordan Lesson Plan* - Students present a course reading as a group to the class, integrating some art aspect. In

pairs they write a Chris Jordan lesson plan and upload to a website created for the course. The goal: integrate the theoretical reading, sustainability, and art. (Posted here: <http://chrisjordan.ning.com/forum/topics/lesson-plans-for-elementary>). Chris Jordan is a Seattle based artist who had a show at the WSU Museum of Art. Jordan's art work is on sustainability and consumption. Students helped to develop the website created by the professor of the course T&L 390: <http://chrisjordan.ning.com/>. The site has lesson plans, resources, and reflections from the students (including connections to their classrooms). The site is endorsed by the Museum of Art and the artist, and will tour with the artist so when the show gets to other sites, teachers can use the website as a resource. Teachers can also add to the site. The show will tour the Pacific Science Center, Seattle; Jordan Schnitzer Museum of Art, University of Oregon, Eugene; Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago; North Carolina Museum of Natural Sciences, Raleigh; and Austin Museum of Art, Austin, TX. This assignment will be adapted to future artists/sustainability experts available.

*Water Project:* A representative of the Palouse Water Conservation Network (<http://www.pwcn.org/>) presented to the students in T&L 390 spring 2009. Students wrote blogs about the visit and connections to their future classes here:

<http://solspire.ning.com/group/s09tl390group/forum/topics/water-projects>. Students discussed how the arts can be a vehicle for supporting advocacy work. When people see images and graphs of data the issues appear much more pointed. Students created either a flyer or a tri-fold pamphlet that provided background and information on Palouse water issues. These also included activities teachers could do with their students on these topics.

*Inventions:* Students created something new from something old. This project focuses on reconceptualizing materials we have already.

<http://solspire.ning.com/group/s09tl390group/forum/topics/inventions-2> Sustainability issues are highlighted on the website:

<http://solspire.ning.com/forum/topics/2064185:Topic:3917>.

*Previous sustainability assignments in 390/594:*

- Energy Harvesting Clothes on YouTube: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Eg1EecP1XA>.
  - Students participated in an international sustainability game that ran for 6 weeks last fall. They made a video and commented on their work at this site: <http://superstructgame.net/StoryView/858> (same video as the YouTube site).
  - The students were filmed by an LA production crew for a sustainability program called "Big Ideas for Small Planets" (filmed by Sundance Channel). Air date is August 2009.
  - Picture slide show of clothing designs students made from recycled materials. There is a used Starbucks cups skirt here and a Dasani water bottle label vest and more. <http://solspire.ning.com/photo/photo/slideshow?albumId=2064185:Album:5284>.
- Standard V: 5.1 A, B, C; 5.2 A, B, C, D; A, B, C, D; 5.4 B

### Secondary Education Program (undergraduate and MIT)

Below are some specific examples of Secondary Education undergraduate and MIT courses that have been revised to include a focus on some element of Standard V.

T&L 464/521 Curriculum and Instruction. *Microteaching Lessons*: Each student is required to formally teach two lessons to peers on a topic of choice. The first lesson (20 minutes in duration) is on any topic of choice and can be teacher or student-centered. The second lesson is 50 minutes, student-centered (with a collaborative planning/teaching approach), and must include a clearly identified content literacy strategy. Each lesson will incorporate the content knowledge, strategies, and skills acquired during this and linked courses. Students are expected to demonstrate that student learning is occurring and the degree to which it is occurring during the lessons by collecting "evidence" from the "students" (peers) during the lesson. The Performance-based Pedagogy Assessment (PPA) rubric will also be introduced at this time. Standard V: 5.1 A, B, C; 5.2 A, B, C; 5.3 A, B

*Integrated Unit Plan*: As a finale to the course, each student will develop a model unit plan (containing eight or more sequential lessons) that demonstrates how thoughtful planning, instruction, and assessment come together to create a coherent learning experience for students. The unit plans will integrate several disciplines (reading and technology required) with an emphasis on universal design and meeting the learning needs of diverse learners. As much as possible, the plan should include elements of T&L 465 and 466 with the unit developed for this course. This unit plan will be adapted in concurrent or future courses, so save it. Standard V: 5.1 A, B, C; 5.2 A, B, C, D; 5.3 A, B, C, D; 5.4 B

T&L 465/506 Social Foundations. *Culture and Community Project*: Learning about the cultural and community contexts of education requires immersion in these contexts outside of the classroom. You will each select a project that requires a minimum of 12 hours experiential contact time with a particular community. You will develop a line of inquiry around your project and present some product of your learning the last week of class at a symposium. Standard V: 5.3 A, B, C, D

T&L 466/525 Classroom Management/Diversity/Community. *Final Project*: Design a classroom management plan that meets the needs of the particular subject and grade you plan to teach. Although the plan may take various forms (narrative; artistic), it must include the following components as well as close attention to diversity issues:

- Discussion of the relationship between classroom management and adolescent identity
- Strategies for collecting student data including communication/voice
- Strategies for prevention of classroom management problems
- Strategies for solving classroom management problems (both general and specific)
- Means of creating and maintaining classroom community with students and parents



- What strengths and concerns you bring to the role of classroom teacher  
Standard V: 5.2 B, C; 5.3 A, B, C, D; 5.4 A, B, C

EdPsych 568/T&L 502 Classroom Assessment. *Response to Intervention/Direct Personal Communication Project*: Students will begin learning how to document, graph, and interpret student data. In this project students will use a variety of methods to make inferences based upon student data and suggest possible interventions with a plan for follow-up after the intervention. Standard V: 5.1 B; 5.2 A, B, C; 5.3 A

*Communicating Achievement Group Project*: Students will develop some communication plans and protocols that they will be able to use while in their careers to communicate with parents/guardians of their students. The project will consist of letters and a mock conference based upon some authentic assessment data. Standard V: 5.1 B; 5.2 A, B; 5.3 A, B, C, D

**Table 2**

WSU Alignment of Standard V with Course Work and Field Experiences (for Elementary, Secondary, and MIT programs)\*

Standards	Course Work and Field Experiences
<b>5.1 Knowledge of Subject Matter and Curriculum Goals</b>	
A. Content Driven	307,317,321,445,402,322,371,390,405,352,385,483,490,415,464, 469,552,556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594,521,528, 513,593,595,600,702
B. Aligned with curriculum standards and outcomes	301,307,317,321,402,322,371,390,403,405,352,385,483,490,415,464,EP 468, 469,552,556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594,521, 528, EP 503, 593,595,600,702
C. Integrated across content areas	307,317,321,445,402,322,371,390,405,352,385,483,490,415,464,469,552,556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594,521, 528, 513, 593,595,600,702
<b>5.2 Knowledge of Teaching</b>	
A. Informed by standards-based assessment	307,317,321,445,EP401,402,322,371,390,405,352,385,SP420,483,490,415,464,EP 468, 469,SP 470,552,556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594,521, 528, 513, SP520,502,593,595,600,702
B. Intentionally planned	307,317,321,445,402,310,322,371,390,EP401,403,405,330,352,385,413,SP420,483,490,415,464,465,466,467, EP468,469, SP470, 552,556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594,521, 528, 513, SP520,502,505, 517,525, 593,595,600,702
C. Influenced by multiple instructional strategies	301,307,317,321,445,EP401,402,310,322,371,390,405,330,352,385,413,SP420,483,490,415,464,466,467, EP 468, 469,SP 470, 552,556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594,521, 528, 513, EP 503, SP520,502,505, 517, 525, 593,595,600,702
D. Informed by technology	317,445,402,390,405,SP420,490,415,466,469,SP 470,594 , SP520,517,593,595,600,702
<b>5.3 Knowledge of Learners and their Development in Social Contexts</b>	
A. Learner centered	301,307,317,321,445,EP401,402,310,322,371,390,403,405,330,352,385,413,SP420,483,490,415,464,465,466,467, EP 468, 469,SP 470, 552,556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594,521, 528, 513, EP 503, SP520,502,505, 517, 525, 593,595,600,702,EA 506
B. Classroom/school centered	301,307,317,321,445,EP401,402,310,322,371,390,403,405,330,352,385,413,SP420,483,490,415,464,465,466,467,

	EP 468, 469, SP 470, 552, 556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594, 521, 528, 513, EP 503, EP 504, SP520, 502, 505, 517, 525, 593, 595, 600, 702, EA 506
C. Family/neighborhood centered	301, 307, 317, 321, 445, 402, 310, 322, 371, 390, 403, 405, 330, 352, 385, 413, SP420, 483, 490, 415, 464, 465, 466, 467, 469, SP 470, 552, 556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594, 521, 528, 513, EP 503, EP 504, SP520, 502, 505, 517, 525, 593, 595, 600, 702, EA 506
D. Contextual community centered	301, 307, 317, 321, 445, 402, 310, 322, 371, 390, 403, 405, 330, 352, 385, 413, SP420, 483, 490, 415, 464, 465, 466, 467, 469, SP 470, 552, 556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594, 521, 528, 513, EP 503, EP 504, SP520, 502, 505, 517, 525, 593, 595, 600, 702, EA 506
<b>5.4 Understanding of Teaching as a Profession</b>	
A. Informed by professional responsibilities and policies	445, EP401, 402, 310, 403, 405, 330, 413, SP420, 490, 415, 464, 465, 466, 467, EP 468, 469, SP 470, KIN 586, 594, 521, 528, 513, EP 503, EP 504, SP520, 502, 505, 517, 525, 593, 595, 600, 702, EA 506
B. Enhanced by a reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practice	317, 321, 445, EP401, 402, 310, 322, 371, 390, 403, 405, 330, 352, 385, 413, SP420, 483, 490, 415, 464, 465, 466, 467, EP 468, 469, SP 470, 552, 556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594, 521, 528, 513, EP 503, EP 504, SP520, 502, 505, 517, 525, 593, 595, 600, 702, EA 506
C. Informed by legal and ethical responsibilities	301, 307, 317, 321, 445, EP401, 402, 310, 322, 371, 390, 403, 405, 330, 352, 385, 413, SP420, 483, 490, 415, 464, 465, 466, 467, EP 468, 469, SP 470, 552, 556, 540, 564, 572, KIN 586, 594, 521, 528, 513, EP 503, EP 504, SP520, 502, 505, 517, 525, 593, 595, 600, 702, EA 506

\* Note: Course work and experiences for the Teacher Education program are aligned with the standards. The emphasis in each course on the aligned standards ranges from: 1= introductory, 2=intermediate, to 3= advanced.  
(See list of course titles in Appendix A.)

## **Field Experiences**

### **Practica**

Over the two years of studying Standard V, several changes have been made to Field Experiences. Below is a highlight of some of those changes.

Students in the Elementary Education undergraduate program complete three practica (two at a beginning level, and one at an advanced level) before student teaching. The seminars that accompany those practica experiences have focused topics that include helping our students to identify and describe student –based evidence, understand the many ways of collecting student-based evidence, and preparing students to complete the signature assignments/assessments which require student-based evidence and now student communication/voice. Faculty in each block of course work/practicum, assign students tasks for collecting and analyzing student-based evidence from their practicum and related to the course content (e.g., math, classroom management, literacy). Students

have the opportunity to take the student-based evidence that they identify or collect in the practica and discuss those pieces of evidence in their course work.

In 2007 the Secondary Education undergraduate program implemented an advanced practicum during the final semester of the program. The seminars that accompany that practicum now focus on a variety of issues including the identification of student-based evidence and student communication/voice evidence.

The MIT students complete a full semester practicum before student teaching. During that full semester practicum, the MIT students are actively collecting student-based evidence as well as conducting a case study on the positive impact on student learning. The student-based evidence and case study become a part of their capstone portfolio which is presented at the end of their program. During those presentations, faculty question and examine the MIT students, which requires that the students explain, justify, and propose rationales for their instruction, based on their student-based evidence.

### **Student Teaching**

All student teachers in the WSU Teacher Education program must collect student-based evidence, analyze the evidence, provide a description/reflection for each piece of evidence, and describe how the data collected influenced their instruction. The students must also provide a narrative that explains their positive impact on student learning. These requirements are a part of the Positive Impact on Student Learning signature assignment/assessment that must be successfully completed to pass student teaching. This signature assignment/assessment is evaluated by a broad range of P-12 partners, supervisors, administrators, and faculty. This signature assignment/assessment has been continually revised since fall of 2007 to be more closely aligned with Standard V. Fall 2009 a new requirement of collecting student communication/voice, in addition to student-based evidence, will be implemented.

### **P-12 District/School Partnerships**

Every semester (beginning fall of 2007) the WSU Teacher Education Program invites P-12 teachers and administrators from the field (from across the State) to participate with faculty and supervisors in a review and evaluation of our signature assignments/assessments. P-12 participants have included early childhood, elementary, middle and high school teachers, as well as principals and assistant superintendents. The P-12 participants have provide the WSU Program with invaluable feedback, ideas, and



suggestions for full implementation of Standard V, but in particular for preparing our teacher candidates to collect student-based evidence and student communication/voice. Their suggestions have significantly impacted the revisions of our courses, assignments, and field experiences. In addition, on each campus faculty have partnerships with school districts (e.g., Spokane School District, Pasco School District, Pullman School District, etc.). These partnerships are extremely collaborative and supportive and inform our course content, assignments, and experiences. Although most P-12 teachers and principals in our various partnerships are not familiar with the new Standard V, the collaborations and joint discussions with our partners has helped us in thinking through how to integrate Standard V criteria and requirements into our Teacher Education program.

#### P-12 Partners in PEAB

During the May 2009 meeting, the WSU Teacher PEAB, along with program faculty, discussed the various definitions of terms in Standard V. A brief overview of the points discussed includes:

##### *PEAB recommended criteria for aesthetic reasoning:*

- Appreciate the “why” behind the appreciation
- First understand the rules of the discipline
- Once the rules are understood, they can be intentionally broken for different effects
- Understand the attributes of the discipline – get at the feelings and emotions produced by the discipline
- Attributes help guide the direction of endeavor – something you feel creates the opportunity for aesthetic reasoning

*This is possible in a discipline such as mathematics. To arrive at the pleasure of mathematics one would seek:*

- Ability to reason about the rationale
- Reasoning behind the emotional reaction

##### *Aesthetic Reasoning Summary:*

- Appreciate an aspect of the discipline, with understanding of why
- Understand attributes of the field
- Participate in the creative act
- Rules  $\Leftrightarrow$  attributes  $\Leftrightarrow$  product
- Gets at feeling, emotions
- Creative pleasure
- Reasoning behind the emotional reaction
- Accept/recognize the subjectivity involved

##### *Mathematical Reasoning Assumes Using Quantitative Information*

- For decision making
- For making inferences
- For authentic purposes

- Qualities:
  - Persistence (analyze errors)
  - Critical reading skills
  - Inferential reading
  - The overall goal is to make sense of real situations through critical analysis of quantitative data.

During the fall Department faculty retreat, more discussions of these terms and how to operationalize them related to teacher-based and student-based evidence will occur. The goal will be to arrive at common definitions of terms, and agreement on what evidence would be appropriate.

### **Faculty Development**

Faculty attended to two Standard V OSPI-sponsored workshops during the fall of 2007 and spring 2008. Faculty attended the OSPI Assessment Conference in 2007, 2008, and 2009. Faculty also attended many WACTE meetings since fall 2007 during which training and education on Standard V has been provided. One faculty member is serving on the State committee to align the PPA with Standard V. After each of these conferences and meetings, the faculty who attended and/or presented are required to share the information with the Department faculty in various ways. Sometimes this information is conveyed to the Department faculty as a whole, and other times the conference activities and professional development experiences are either communicated to or conducted with the faculty in each of the program areas (Elementary, Secondary, and MIT).

In addition, if faculty attend national conferences that are related to elements of Standard V, they present their findings at the Department meetings and/or program meetings. Depending on the topic and issue, the same information is shared with the Teacher Education Committee that has representatives serving from all of the endorsement/content areas. Those faculty representatives then bring that information back to their respective department faculty. PEAB members share with the program faculty at PEAB meetings any relevant information from the State PEAB meetings also.

At each program meeting (e.g., Elementary Education), approximately once a month, the topic of Standard V is/has been examined or explored, depending on the needs of the program and faculty. At almost all Department meetings over the past two years (includes all programs and all campuses) some aspect of Standard V has been addressed. And at all Department retreats professional development and/or faculty discussions about Standard V have been included.

**3. In no more than three pages, describe the *process* used to engage program personnel in reviewing, rethinking, and revising the program.**

The process of engaging faculty in reviewing, rethinking, and revising the program occurred on many different levels. A significant part of the process involved WSU's Teacher Education PEAB. The PEAB has been instrumental in providing feedback, suggestions, and recommendation throughout the revision process (beginning May 2007). Faculty have implemented many of suggestions made by our PEAB, revised their courses per PEAB recommendations, and changed field experiences based on the PEAB feedback. The results of these revisions are continually shared with PEAB which creates a cyclical process of review and revision. (See the PEAB Chairs' letter included in this report in which the Chairs' outlined the PEAB's involvement in this process.)

The review of program alignment with Standard V and the development of program signature assignments/assessments occurred simultaneously. During the summer of 2007, faculty developed four common signature assignments/assessments that every WSU teacher candidate was required to successfully complete. (See Section 1 of this narrative and Table 1 for more information on the signature assignments/assessments.). These signature assignments/assessments are evaluated by P-12 personnel, supervisors, and faculty using a standardized rubric and the results are used for program improvement. As faculty refined and revised these signature assignments/assessments, they integrated aspects of Standard V. This integration of Standard V into the signature assignments/assessments required then that course content, field experiences, and assignments needed to be revised also. This activity began fall 2007 and is currently continuing.

At each faculty program meeting (once per month), and at each Department meeting (once per month) and at each Department retreat (August and January) since fall 2007, selected elements of Standard V have been discussed and faculty have been engaged in some sort of revision activity. In addition, some faculty have attended OSPI professional development workshops, as well as the OPSI assessment conference. Those faculty were charged with bringing new ideas and information about Standard V back to the faculty as a whole. As a result, some faculty meetings have included presentations on Standard V by the faculty who attended the workshops and conferences.

During the process of examining our program and its alignment with Standard V, faculty reviewed and examined all course work, field experiences, and student teaching. Initially the faculty felt that the revisions addressed Standard V 5.1 A, B, (needed program revisions for alignment with 5.1 C); 5.2 A, B, and D (needed program revisions for alignment with 5.2 C [personalized instruction]); 5.3 A (needed revisions for alignment with 5.3 B, C, D); and 5.4 A, B, and C.

A wide variety of activities have been conducted during these review and revision meetings (with more planned for fall 2009). Some meetings were spent reviewing program syllabi and topics of Standard V and evaluating the alignment, other meetings were spent discussing and learning about particular phrases in Standard V (e.g., student-based evidence, personalized instruction, aesthetic reasoning, sustainability, etc.), and still other meetings were more “training focused” such as the three meetings in which faculty viewed and discussed the DVDs/CDs provided in OSPI workshops/WACTE meetings on Standard V (Professional Development in Action) (fall 2007, spring 2008 and fall 2008). The Professional Development in Action DVDs/CDs were particularly helpful in developing a sense of what is meant by “student voice,” “student-based evidence,” and “evidentiary teaching.” A partial list of topics/activities (below) for some of the faculty meetings provide information on what has been a focus of the faculty in the past two years:

Retreat, fall 2007: What is aesthetic reasoning? Panel presentation and group discussion; What is sustainability? Panel presentation and group discussion.

Fall 2007 faculty meetings: How to assist teacher candidates in the integration of mathematical, scientific, and, aesthetic reasoning into the Integrated Unit Plans and Positive Impact on Student Learning signature assignments/assessments; Course work alignment and revisions.

Spring 2008 faculty meetings: Including student-based evidence in the four signature assignments/assessments; Assisting students throughout the program with collecting student-based data, evaluating the data, and making instructional decisions based on the data.

Fall 2008 faculty meetings: revisions of rubrics for four signature assignments/assessments to more clearly focus on elements in Standard V (e.g., “Integrated across content areas,” “Intentionally planned,” “Contextual community centered,” etc.).

Spring 2009: Working groups in Elementary and Secondary Education (including MIT) identified ways within each program to coherently build student capacity to collect student-based evidence, analyze the evidence, and reflect on student communication/voice;

Continued work on defining aesthetic reasoning, sustainability, personalized instruction, and contextual community centered instruction – as relevant to the WSU program; Working committees formed to address 5.1C (in particular as related to the Secondary Education program and Integrated Unit Plan, the signature assignment/assessment), 5.2 C (in particular as related to the Elementary Education program), and 5.3 B,C,D(to clarify what these terms mean and then to identify where in each program these components are addressed).

The process of moving toward full implementation of Standard V has been a recursive one. That is, the faculty explore and examine aspects of Standard V, build their knowledge and understanding, revise aspects of courses/experiences based on those understandings, and bring feedback and outcomes to faculty meetings for continuing examination. The Teacher Education Committee and the PEAB have contributed to these interactive discussions and revisions, supporting the Department faculty in implementing Standard V. See previous section for an overview of one PEAB meeting in May 2009 when discussions of Standard V terms and definitions occurred.



**4. In no more than two pages, describe the key strategies by which candidates will develop capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence. Please attach three samples of assignments or assessments that represent those strategies.**

The curriculum and field experiences in each of the WSU Teacher Education program areas (Elementary, Secondary, and MIT) have been designed to build students' knowledge and skills progressively. Three key strategies are evident across the sequence of course work and levels of practicum experiences in all program areas. First, faculty employ the strategies of direct instruction/guided instruction-practice at the beginning of each program area, move to having students practice and then reflect on the data they've collected (analyze, respond instructionally), and then move to having students apply knowledge and skills at the culmination of the program (student teaching). To illustrate how these key strategies are implemented so that our students build the capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence, the undergraduate Elementary Education program area on the Pullman campus is described here (not enough space to describe all variations of the direct instruction/guided instruction-practice, practice and reflect, and application strategies across all areas – Secondary Education, MIT).

The undergraduate Elementary Education program area in Pullman is offered in four Blocks. Block I includes literacy, technology, and assessment course work and a beginning practicum; Block II includes management, literacy, foundations, and science course work and an intermediate practicum; Block III includes social studies, math, diversity, special education, English language learners course work and an advanced practicum; and, Block IV includes student teaching. In Block I, the faculty employ direct instruction and guided instruction-practice to begin the development of students' capacity to analyze and respond to student-based evidence. For example, students enrolled in assessment are provided instruction in identifying and analyzing student-based evidence. These same students then use that knowledge and those skills in completing assignments on student-based evidence in the technology and literacy courses, as well as in practicum assignments. In Block II, students continue to build their knowledge of and skills for identifying and analyzing student-based evidence through practice and reflection activities in the management, literacy, and science courses. They explore what student-based evidence might be as related to 5.3 B, C, and D in the foundations course. They are also expected to collect student-based evidence, analyze the evidence (practice), and respond instructionally to that evidence in their practicum through reflection activities (intermediate level). In Block III, students collect and analyze student-based evidence in their advanced practicum

and use that evidence in their Block III course work assignments (as the advanced practicum comes before the course work) (practice and reflection). Finally, in Block IV, students collect student-based evidence as a part of the Positive Impact on Student Learning signature assignment/assessment during student teaching (application).

All of the WSU Teacher Education program areas use these scaffolding strategies, with slight variations in the course work sequences and length of field placements. All program areas require 3-4 practicum experiences before student teaching, so that students gradually build the capacity to collect, analyze, and respond to student-based evidence. Due to the intensiveness and short duration of the MIT programs, students in those programs are expected to move to the application level during the pre-internship/practicum. Course work offered simultaneously with the pre-internship/practicum provides instruction in and scaffolding for these students in moving to the application level.

The Teacher Education program uses the Pedagogy Performance Assessment Instructional Plan as the lesson plan format for instructional purposes in all course work and also to prepare students for completing the PPA Instructional Plan during student teaching. The faculty revised the Instructional Plan to align with Standard V by including a requirement that, as appropriate, students must describe how they will collect student-based evidence and student communication/voice evidence. This requirement will provide students in the math methods course, for example, to indicate the student-based math evidence, and the relevant student communication/voice evidence that will be collected and analyzed. The new required section of the PPA Instructional Plan will be implemented in all course work and field experiences fall 2009.

The Positive Impact on Student Learning assignment/assessment rubric, the Integrated Unit Plan Rubric, and the Classroom Management Plan rubric are included in Appendix B as three examples of assignments/assessments that address various aspects of student-based evidence and student communication/voice. These are completed by all WSU teacher candidates (Elementary, Secondary, and MIT).

**5. In no more than two pages, describe areas of your revised program that will be a focus of continuing attention and development as you proceed with implementation.**

The WSU faculty plan to focus next on three broad areas: research and evaluation (including data collection and analysis), the student teaching experience, and developing resources related to Standard V. Within each broad area, a wide variety of assessment, research, evaluation, and development activities will be conducted.

### **Research and Evaluation**

The WSU faculty are interested in studying the effects of all the changes made in course work and field experiences, since some of the elements of Standard V have yet to be studied. An example of data that has been collected and will continue to be collected in order to study aspects of Standard V implementation include: Aggregated and disaggregated data from the four signature assignments/assessments to study the effects of adding requirements of collecting student-based evidence and student communication/voice evidence; data from student teaching supervisors regarding WSU students' performance in collecting and responding to student-based evidence and student communication/voice evidence; data from P-12 partners on the impact of implementing Standard V elements in their classrooms with WSU student teachers; data from standardized assessments of teacher knowledge (e.g., WEST E scores); data from EBI scores; etc. Because WSU faculty have archived data from before the inclusion of Standard V elements, they will be able to compare P-12 students' and WSU students' performance before and after implementation of Standard V. Faculty are also in the process of developing a self-assessment tool so that WSU students can evaluate their own performance relative to Standard V elements as they progress through the WSU Teacher Education program.

A small sample of the research questions of interest include:

1. Does the inclusion of an emphasis on student-based evidence and student communication/voice improve WSU students' performance? If so, in what areas?
2. Does the inclusion of an emphasis on student-based evidence and student communication/voice improve P-12 students' performance? If so, in what areas?
3. Does making instruction "personalized" improve P-12 students' performance?
4. Does the inclusion of a requirement that WSU students address student-based evidence and student communication/voice in their instructional plans improve the quality of their plans and/or improve the quality of their instruction?

5. Does the inclusion of and focus on sustainability and aesthetic reasoning change/improve the quality of instruction WSU students demonstrate during student teaching? If so, in what areas?

6. Does self-assessment improve students' performance relative to Standard V descriptions of practice and teacher-based criteria?

These are only a few examples of research questions the WSU faculty have and wish to explore. They are considering many other areas of study related to Standard V.

### **Student Teaching Experience**

WSU faculty will focus of continuing attention and development to the student teaching experience, as related to Standard V. The faculty are interested in exploring evaluation and assessment tools that capture student teaching performance in general, and student teaching performance as related to elements of Standard V, in particular. The faculty will participate in a pilot study, with other universities around the US in designing and implementing a student teaching evaluation tool. In addition, faculty will continue their efforts in the development of a co-teaching model for student teaching, with particular attention to the alignment of that model with Standard V elements.

### **Curriculum and Instruction Resources Development**

Faculty will focus their attention on developing resources for WSU students and P-12 partners related to the following elements of Standard V: a) integration of mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning, as well as sustainability across content areas (5.1 C). Part of this process will involve developing some common understandings about the terms in Standard V, and then an agreement about teacher-based and student-based evidence related to those terms (see PEAB discussion described previously); b) personalized instruction (5.2C); c) and classroom/school, family/neighborhood, and contextual community centered instruction (5.3 B, C, D). These resources may include such products as manuals (How to..?), exemplars, and/or a compendium of strategies that faculty will use in their course work but will also be appropriate for WSU students' to use with P-12 learners as well. These resources (and perhaps others to be developed) will contribute to deepening WSU students' and P-12 partners' understanding and implementation of Standard V elements. It is hoped that these resources will improve WSU students' knowledge, skills and performance, as well as positively impact P-12 students' performance.

**6. Please attach a letter from the PEAB chair that describes the PEAB's involvement in reviewing and revising the program.**  
(See letter attached.)